

## PMSummerColpEM Resource

---

**From:** Wentzel, Michael  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 08, 2010 11:01 AM  
**To:** PMSummerColpEM Resource  
**Subject:** Summary of June 7, 2010 phone call with Summer to discuss hydrology

### MEMORANDUM TO: File (Summer Units 2 and 3)

From: Michael Wentzel, Project Manager  
AP1000Projects Branch (NWE1)  
Division of New reactor Licensing  
Office of New Reactors

Subject: Summary of June 7, 2010 phone call with Summer to discuss hydrology

Purpose: To discuss Summer's supplemental response to RAI 2.4.12-6

The NRC attendees were:

- Daniel Barnhurst, Michael Wentzel and Joe Sebrosky
- Michael Fayer, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)

The applicant participants included:

- SCE&G: Amy M. Monroe, James Fender, Joe Gillespie, John Todd, Justin Bouknight, and Kyle Young
- Bechtel: Dan Patton and Dave Fenster

In preparation for the phone call the staff developed the following topics of discussion related to RAI 2.4.12-6:

1) Post-construction Site Topography above the 394' Contour. Figure 2.5.4-245 (the Site Grade Plan) provides a good site-wide view of the topography, but it lacks topographic specificity in the vicinity of the two reactors. For example, unofficial drawings indicate drainage swales and catch basins near the reactors; these features can't be seen in Figure 2.5.4-245. It would be helpful to see a Site Grade Plan for the area bounded by the 394' contour which used one-foot contour intervals to clarify the locations of surface water routing pathways and zones where the soil surface is above 398 ft.

2) Post-construction soil properties in the reactor areas above the 394' Contour. Figures 2.5.4-219 to -223 show in cross section roughly where structural fill and common fill will be placed within the excavation. For those areas above the 394' contour, will each fill material be emplaced up to the soil surface? Or will topsoil be brought in? If so, how much and what properties will it have?

3) Areal distribution of post construction surface features above the 394' elevation contour. A map or GIS coverage identifying areas of pavement; grass; gravel; concrete pads; structures; whatever other surface features are envisioned.

4) Storm Water Basins. What are the maximum surface water elevations possible in each basin? Are they lined? Do they have a drain system that lowers the water elevation to a minimum level? If so, what is that minimum level?

During the phone call, SCE&G agreed to provide an estimate of permeable vs impermeable land cover on the Summer 2&3 site based on FSAR Figure 2.5.4-245. This would facilitate the confirmatory calculations that must be performed as part of the staff's review and should address agenda items 1-3. The NRC expressed the desire for this information to be included in the FSAR.

During discussions on the storm water basins, SCE&G stated that those are dry detention basins designed to empty within the timeframe required by South Carolina regulations. SCE&G agreed to provide the references to the state requirements for those basins.

Additionally, SCE&G and the NRC agreed to a follow-up phone call on June 10, 2010 to further discuss these issues.

**Hearing Identifier:** VCSummer\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 289

**Mail Envelope Properties** (C0A338EE37A11447B136119705BF9A3F70F9C8B8C5)

**Subject:** Summary of June 7, 2010 phone call with Summer to discuss hydrology  
**Sent Date:** 6/8/2010 11:01:20 AM  
**Received Date:** 6/8/2010 11:01:20 AM  
**From:** Wentzel, Michael

**Created By:** Michael.Wentzel@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**  
"PMSummerColpEM Resource" <PMSummerColpEM.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	3123	6/8/2010 11:01:20 AM

**Options**  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**